

CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
1st FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
FORT LAUDERDALE CITY HALL
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
OCTOBER 28, 2014
9:00 A.M.

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative attendance 2/2014 through 1/2015	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Howard Elfman, Chair	P	7	1
Chad Thilborger, Vice Chair	P	5	3
Paul Dooley	P	8	0
Genia Ellis	P	7	1
Joan Hinton	P	7	1
Howard Nelson	P	7	1
Lakni Mohnani	P	5	0
PJ Espinal [Alternate]	A	0	7
Joshua Miron [Alternate]	A	2	5
Robert Smith [Alternate]	P	6	1

Staff Present

Bruce Jolly, Board Attorney
Rhonda Hasan, Assistant City Attorney
Yvette Ketor, Secretary, Code Enforcement Board
Peggy Burks, Clerk III
Shani Allman, Clerk III
Deanna Bojman, Clerk III
Porshia Goldwire, Administrative Aide
Olivia Vargas, Clerk III [Interpreter]
Alex Hernandez, Interim Building Official
Robert Masula, Building Inspector
George Oliva, Building Inspector
Jamie Opperee, Prototype Inc., Recording Secretary

Communication to the City Commission

None.

Respondents and Witnesses

CE14041296: Nectaria Chakas, attorney
CE14090230: Maria Vasile, owner
CE13041247: Hue Sidman, owner; Daniel O'Connor, broker
CE14041304; CE14041300; CE14041306: Eleftheria Zachariades, attorney

CE14041293: Bobbi-Lee Meloro, attorney
CE14970292: Dylan Lagi, owner
CE13111632: Josephine Jones, owner
CE14062319: Alain Harounoff, previous owner
CE14022025: Gabriella Santoro-Urso, owner's representative
CE13101596: Thomas Kopf, power of attorney
CE14051847: David Naramo, owner; Alva Lee Granam, contractor
CE14031823: James Wickham, owner; Peter Fogg, contractor
CE14062352: Michael Krant, architect
CE13121736: Matthew Lunde, owner
CE14080898: Jorge Hernandez, general contractor
CE08070448: Claire Clark, owner's representative; Goran Dragoslavac, owner
CE14050975: Carlos Rodriguez, realtor; Alexander Ruiz, owner's representative
CE14040884: Lucaster Carr, owner's representative
CE14070818: Dennis Brooks, owner; Tho Brooks, owner
CE12030489: Dennis Roth, attorney
CE14071289: John MacDonald, owner
CE14041075: Jimmy Baker, owner
CE14082172: Edwynne Murphy, attorney; Thomas Sparks, neighbor; Paul Kim, attorney; Mark Serer, architect
CE10122009: Steven Meister, owner
CE14061156: Marc Obas, owner; Eric Martinez, contractor
CE14072221: Brandy Joe Pollock, owner
CE14051257: Tyrone Powell, owner; Alicia Ellis, witness
CE11121644: Edwin Stacker, attorney
CE14091100: Danny Sam Freier, owner
CE14092015: Laurie Matuszak Karamat, owner; Khaqan Karamat, owner
CE14021929: Madeline Medina, owner's representative; Eric Martinez, contractor
CE14030847: Kettya Amarai, owner
CE14090039: Vincenzo Esposito, owner; Juan Cardona, general contractor
CE14050776: Geraldine Adams, owner; Roger Adams, owner
CE14071242: Jack Braunstein, owner
CE14051967: Anthony Cicalese, tenant
CE14052132: Michael Matta, owner's representative
CE14050427: Carol Facey, owner's representative

[The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.]

Individuals wishing to speak on any of the cases on today's agenda were sworn in.

The following five cases at the same address were heard together:

Case: CE14041293

209 N Ftl Beach Blvd 2B
PERLO, LISA LUTOFF

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported that permit applications for all five cases had been resubmitted with corrections on 10/22/14. Before he could sign off on the applications, Inspector Masula stated he needed to make a site visit for each case. He recommended no extension be granted and the cases be rescheduled to impose fines. If he were granted access to the apartments before the next hearing, he would recommend the cases be rescheduled as old business cases instead of Massey hearings.

Inspector Masula stated he had a meeting with a unit owner's attorney and contractor, at which they had denied him access to inspect the unit. He said the unit owners were concerned that he would find other violations when he entered the property but he had assured them he was only concerned with the violations for which the owners had been cited.

Eleftheria Zachariades, attorney for Gilbert and Kathleen Foulon, Nivea Cordova Berrios and Anthony Robinson, said the City's objections to her clients' applications were not founded. One objection they took issue with was that the building contractor did not have the appropriate license to do the work. She stated the building contractor could do structural work up to three floors, but none of this work was structural; these were interior front doors. She reported they had hired a general contractor and submitted the applications. Ms. Zachariades stated at a meeting with Interim Building Official Alex Hernandez and Assistant City Attorney Rhonda Hasan, they had been informed that there must be two forms of egress from the unit. It had taken significant time to research the issue and correct the plans.

Ms. Zachariades continued that Inspector Masula "demands to come into our entire unit: that's not happening. The violation is for the front door; he's permitted to enter and examine the back of the front door and the front of the front door, and that is it; that is what our violation is for." She stated Inspector Masula could not examine the foyer or anything further.

Ms. Zachariades explained that they had not picked up the plans until they were prepared to resubmit the applications.

Nectaria Chakas, attorney for Robert Roselli, confirmed that the delay in resubmitting the plans had been because they had all new plans drawn and interviewed general contractors. She agreed inspector Masula could inspect "the back of the front door" including the walls in the foyer. Ms. Chakas requested a 60-day extension.

Bobbi-Lee Meloro, attorney for Lisa Lutoff Perlo, agreed with the inspection plan. She said she had her client had met with Inspector Masula.

Inspector Masula clarified he must inspect the entire door installation, including the adjacent walls in the foyer where the original door had been demolished.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14041296

209 N Ftl Beach Blvd 5B
ROSELLI, ROBERT M

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14041300

209 N Ftl Beach Blvd 8B
ROBINSON, ANTHONY

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14041306

209 N Ftl Beach Blvd 9G
CORDOVA BERRIOS, NIVEA

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14041304

209 N Ftl Beach Blvd 11B
FOULON, GILBERT & KATHLEEN

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE11121644

2765 Northeast 14 Street # PH1(PHW)
FALK, CHARLES E SR

This case was first heard on 10/23/12 to comply by 1/22/13. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported there had been no permit activity toward compliance.

Edwin Stacker, attorney, reminded the Board that his client's permit application for a boat lift had been denied and they had appealed to the Circuit Court, which had recently denied the petition. He said his client intended to either remove his boat lift, lease one of the two legal lifts or wait for one of the other boat lift to be removed so his boatlift could be permitted. Mr. Stacker requested 60 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14050776

3200 South Andrews Avenue
GERALDINE M ADAMS TR
ADAMS, GERALDINE TRSTEE

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the owner had removed the wood framing from the interior, complying that section of the violation. He recommended a 91-day extension for the owner to obtain a permit to enclose the opening in the fire partition wall.

Geraldine Adams, owner, agreed to the extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10122009

2343 Northwest 12 Court
MORTGAGE CAPITAL PARTNERS LLC

This case was first heard on 2/25/14 to comply by 5/27/14, amended to 6/24/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported they were awaiting the permit for the air conditioner. He recommended a 91-day extension.

Steven Meister, owner, agreed to the extension.

Motion made by Mr. Thilborger, seconded by Mr. Nelson, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE12030489

1843 Southwest 4 Avenue
HATCHER, RICHARD

This case was first heard on 7/24/12 to comply by 9/25/12. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Dennis Roth, attorney, said they had received authority from the court to be responsible for managing the property. He stated all squatters had been removed, the grass had been cut and all debris removed and the property was secure. The house was put on the market recently and he believed it would sell quickly.

Mr. Nelson asked the condition of the property and Inspector Oliva confirmed it was secure and clean.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14040884

1630 Northwest 25 Terrace
SRP SUB LLC

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 9/23/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of a \$6,800 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the master permit application for the interior work had been submitted on 9/22. The property manager had indicated the air conditioner application would be submitted in the near future. Inspector Oliva recommended a 91-day extension.

Lucaster Carr, contractor, requested additional time to pull the air conditioner permit.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14041075

2165 Northwest 19 Street
STRAIGHTLINE MASONRY INC

This case was first heard on 6/24/14 to comply by 7/22/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was in compliance, fines had accrued to \$3,850 and the City was requesting the full fine be imposed.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, confirmed the property was in compliance and recommended reducing the fine to \$1,200 to cover administrative costs for two hearings.

Jimmy Baker, owner, requested a fine reduction to \$800 or less.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to find that the violations were not in compliance by the Order date, and to impose a fine of \$1,000. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14031823

733 Northwest 15 Terrace
WICKHAM, JAMES DAVID

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the permits applications had been submitted on 9/22 and were ready to be issued. He recommended a 119-day extension.

Peter Fogg, contractor, said he was thinking of installing battery operated lights instead of wired electric lights because the permits cost more than the lighting.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14030847

3110 Southwest 17 Street
AMARAI, KETTYA
SEYOUM, ABIY

This case was first heard on 2/25/14 to comply by 5/27/14 amended to 6/24/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, said there had been no progress on the property. Since the air conditioner had been installed without a permit, it must be removed or replaced.

Kettya Amarai, owner, said she had hired the architect to create plans for the carport and they intended to replace the air conditioner unit because it was not working. She anticipated submitting the application for the carport in the next week or so. Mr. Nelson was concerned about the amount of time that had passed since the case was first heard. Ms. Amarai explained to Chair Nelson that she had received a loan modification, which required hiring a lawyer and now she could move forward with complying the violations.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-1 with Mr. Mohnani opposed.

Case: CE13121736

837 North Andrews Avenue
LUNDE, MATTHEW J

This case was first heard on 6/24/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance. Ms. Goldwire read an email from Zoning Administrator Anthony Fajardo recommending an extension for the owner to address some issues on the plans.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported Zoning had recommended corrections to the plans. Inspector Oliva recommended a 91-day extension.

Matthew Lunde, owner, reported they were working on compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14070818

1641 North Andrews Square
BROOKS FAMILY PROPERTIES IV LLC

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported three permit applications had been submitted on 10/17. He recommended a 91-day extension.

Dennis Brooks, owner, was present.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14051967

5130 North Federal Highway # 2
TFRE HOLDINGS INC

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported a new application had been submitted but had failed review and was awaiting pickup for corrections.

Anthony Cicalese, tenant, said the inspector had explained what was needed to resubmit the permit. He described the possible costs and said he had negotiated with the owners concerning a rent reduction to help cover the costs. He was still getting estimates from engineers and as soon as he had one, the contractor would resubmit the plans. Mr. Cicalese requested 90 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14050975

1509 Northwest 4 Street
NICHOLLS, WHILMAR

This case was first heard on 9/23/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the master permit and all sub-permit applications had been submitted and recommended a 91-day extension.

Alexander Ruiz, the owner's representative, requested additional time.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14022025

619 Southwest 20 Terrace
FIVE TEN FLORIDA IV LLC

This case was first heard on 7/22/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the master permit application had been submitted on 10/20. He recommended a 119-day extension. He later stated FBC 2010 105.4.11 was in compliance.

Gabriella Santoro-Urso, the owner's representative, requested a 119-day extension. She stated the property was occupied by a tenant.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 119-day extension to 2/24/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-1 with Ms. Ellis opposed.

Case: CE13041247

124 Hendricks Isle
SIDMAN, HUE KIM

This case was first heard on 6/24/14 to comply by 7/22/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported there had been no permit activity and he did not support an extension. He confirmed that the parking lot had been resealed and relined without a permit.

Daniel O'Connor, broker, said the first sale had fallen through but the property was under contract again and would close on 12/29/14. The new buyer was aware of the situation and had already hired an architect to perform a complete renovation on the property.

Mr. Mohnani opined that this was not regulated by the Florida Building Code. He read from the code: "Items not regulated by the Florida Building Code: resurfacing, restriping or sealcoating of the parking lot requires a Zoning Improvement permit." Mr. Nelson thought this would have been a good argument for the respondent to make for an appeal within 30 days after the case was first heard.

Ms. Ellis pointed out that the owner intended to pass the issue to the next owner and the Board did not know the new owner would address the issue.

The Board took no action.

Case: CE14070292

313 Northeast 2 Street # 701
LAGI, DYLAN MATTHEW

This case was first heard on 7/22/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported the electrical and plumbing permit applications had been submitted in January and had failed review three times. Both had been pending pickup for corrections since 10/7/14. He did not support any additional extension. Inspector Masula informed Mr. Nelson of the dates the applications had failed review and been resubmitted. He said he felt the owner was trying to work toward compliance but had experienced problems with architects and contractors. Inspector Masula said he could not support an extension because of the time frame and there were life safety issues involved.

Dylan Lagi, owner, said he had submitted the plumbing and electrical revisions with all corrections the previous day. He stated Mr. Hernandez had indicated that no mechanical inspection would be required. Inspector Masula felt Mr. Hernandez might have been unaware of the background of the case when he had rendered that opinion. He hoped his opinion had changed since he had provided him an update.

Mr. Hernandez said he was unaware of the email to which Mr. Lagi referred.

Inspector Masula confirmed in the computer that the revisions had been resubmitted.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

The Board took a brief break.

Case: CE13111632

335 Southwest 18 Avenue
JONES, RICHARD H III &
JONES, JOSEPHINE
New Owner: SOFREI LLC

This case was first heard on 3/25/14 to comply by 5/27/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported he carport roof had been removed but the other violations remained.

Josephine Jones, former owner, said they had sold the property in May and the new owner was aware of the violations at purchase. She asked to be removed from the case.

Ms. Hasan said the case could be kept open and transferred to the name of the new owner. She agreed to have staff transfer the case.

Inspector Oliva confirmed that the new owner had been present at the previous hearing. Mr. Jolly confirmed that the former owner could be removed from the case.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14071242

4394 North Federal Highway
JACK BRAUNSTEIN REV LIV TR
BRAUNSTEIN, JACK TRSTEE

This case was first heard on 9/23/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance. Ms. Goldwire read a letter from Mr. Braunstein stating unit 8 was in compliance and requesting a 60-day extension to bring unit 16 into compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported Inspector Pignataro had inspected the property and determined that unit 8 had been converted back but unit 16 was not. He

clarified that some framing and drywall in front of a door must be removed and the door must open from the main unit into the bedroom.

Jack Braunstein, owner, said he intended to comply but one of the tenants in unit 16 was not cooperating and he would need to remove him. He said this would take at least 60 days. Mr. Braunstein confirmed that only one tenant remained in all of unit 16.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14050427
6840 Northwest 31 Way
MCKEE, STEVEN

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 9/23/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, distributed photos of the property and reported the master permit application had been submitted. He recommended a 91-day extension. Inspector Oliva reminded the Board that the case was begun in May and a Stop Work Order had been posted on the property.

Carol Facey, the owner's representative, said the county records indicted the home had been constructed with a garage. She confirmed the property was occupied and requested 91 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14021929
3000 Southwest 4 Avenue
CELLULAR SUPPLIES REAL ESTATE INC

This case was first heard on 7/22/14 to comply by 9/23/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the master permit application had been submitted. He recommended a 119-day extension.

Madeline Medina, the owner's representative, said they were working on the mechanical portion of the plans and requested additional time.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 91-day extension. Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Medina requested 91 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 119-day extension to 2/24/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14051847

708 Southwest 24 Avenue
707 SEYBOLD LLC

This case was first heard on 9/23/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the master permit application had been submitted and recommended a 91-day extension.

Alva Lee Granam, contractor, said they had submitted all documents and requested 91 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14051257

2501 Southwest 5 Place
POWELL, TYRONE G

This case was first heard on 9/23/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported FBC (2010) 105.1 item 3 and FBC (2010) 111.1.1 were in compliance. He needed to confirm when the windows had been installed and recommended a 28-day extension. Inspector Oliva confirmed the tenant had been removed from the garage.

Tyrone Powell, owner, said he had submitted the window permit application and would wait for Inspector Oliva to inspect.

Motion made by Mr. Thilborger, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote, motion passed 5-2 with Mr. Mohnani and Mr. Nelson opposed.

Case: CE08070448

1431 Northwest 11 Place
DRAGOSLAVIC, GORAN
DRAGOSLAVIC, TERESA

This case was first heard on 6/24/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the permit had been issued that morning and recommended a 119-day extension for inspections.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Dooley, to grant a 119-day extension to 2/24/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14092015

3000 E Sunrise Blvd #14A
KARAMAT, KHAQAN
KARAMAT, LAURIE

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE COMPLETE REMODELING OF THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS.

1. THE SECOND DOOR FOR THE KITCHEN HAS BEEN CLOSED OFF FROM THE INSIDE AND THE DOOR IS STILL IN PLACE FROM THE HALLWAY SIDE.
2. THE KITCHEN CEILING HAS BEEN FRAMED DOWN AND NEW DRYWALL.
3. THERE IS NEW FRAMING AND DRYWALL/TILE BACKER BOARD THROUGHOUT.
4. THIS WORK INCLUDES NEW FRAMING AND DRYWALL WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 105.4.4

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE COMPLETE REMODELING OF THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS. THIS WORK INCLUDES:

1. NEW PLUMBING FIXTURES THAT ARE BEING INSTALLED THROUGHOUT WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 105.4.5

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE COMPLETE REMODELING OF THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS. THIS WORK INCLUDES:

1. NEW ELECTRICAL AND UPGRADED SERVICE PANEL, NEW WIRING (ROMEX), NEW SWITCHES AND NEW OUTLETS THROUGHOUT. THIS WORK WAS PERFORMED WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 105.4.11

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE COMPLETE REMODELING OF THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS. THIS WORK INCLUDES:

1. NEW MECHANICAL DUCT WORK WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.
2. A NEW SOFFIT WITH DUCT WORK HAS BEEN BUILT IN THE KITCHEN.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE COMPLETE REMODELING OF THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS. THE UNIT OWNER WILL BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN ALL REQUIRED PERMITS FOR THIS SCOPE OF WORK. THESE PERMITS WILL NEED TO BE ISSUED, INSPECTED, PASSED AND CLOSED PRIOR TO THIS CODE CASE BEING FULLY COMPLIED AND CLOSED.

Inspector Masula submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. He reported the unlicensed contractor had been arrested and a Stop Work Order posted on the property on 9/26. Inspector Masula recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$100 per day, per violation.

Laurie Matuszak Karamat, owner, said they had purchased the unit on 5/31/14 and the contractor had suggested additional work over and above their original plans. She explained they lived elsewhere and were not able to monitor what the contractor was doing. When they became aware of the violations, they had met with Inspector Masula and then the condo representatives to explain the situation. They had been referred to an architect and a general contractor and the contractor was proceeding with submitting the permit application.

Khaqan Karamat, owner, stated work was ongoing when they purchased the unit and there had been no open permits. He said they had already paid the architect and general contractor to begin work. Mr. Karamat doubted the work could be done in 28 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 119 days, by 2/24/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14061156

2421 Southwest 5 Place
OBAS, MARC ANTOINE H/E
OBAS, LAURIANE

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 10/9/14.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED AND CONSTRUCTION WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS, INSPECTIONS AND THE C.O.

1. THE CARPORT WAS ENCLOSED AND IS USED AS A STORAGE ROOM WITH A PERMIT ISSUED BY THE CITY. THE OWNER HAS TURNED THE STORAGE ROOM INTO AN ONE BEDROOM RENTAL APARTMENT. BY HIS ACTIONS THE DWELLING IS BEING USED AS A DUPLEX IN A SINGLE FAMILY ZONE. **(COMPLIED)**

2. WINDOWS AND FRONT DOOR WERE REPLACED IN ALL THE OPENINGS.

3. A CENTRAL DUCTED A/C WAS INSTALLED IN THE DWELLING.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT THE REQUIRED INSPECTIONS APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Complied:
FBC(2010) 111.1.1

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation. He confirmed that the Occupancy violation was in compliance; the only outstanding issues were the windows and the air conditioning. Inspector Oliva informed Ms. Ellis that there was a separate Code Enforcement case on the property for work done on the driveway.

Eric Martinez, contractor, stated he had been hired to resolve the window and air conditioner permit issues. They had executed the permit applications and were trying to ensure that the ductwork could be certified instead of replaced.

Marc Obas, owner, was present.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14082172
2200 S Ocean La # 910
BUTTERFIELD LTD

Certified mail sent to the owner was hand delivered on 10/20/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED. A WALL IN THE KITCHEN HAS BEEN REBUILT WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMIT AND/OR INSPECTIONS. THIS WALL ALSO NOW ENCROACHES INTO UNIT 909 KITCHEN SPACE. THIS WALL NEEDS TO BE REVERTED BACK TO THE ORIGINAL LAYOUT.

Inspector Masula submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$50 per day.

Ms. Hasan stated she had been handed a motion to continue the hearing.

Edwynne Murphy, attorney, requested additional time to comply. He explained that Mr. Jack Oriel was the sole member of Butterfield Ltd. and was out of the country after having surgery. Mr. Murphy stated he was trying to get power of attorney to represent Mr. Oriel.

Mr. Mohnani said Mr. Oriel was a former business partner and he would recuse himself from hearing this case. Mr. Jolly explained that if Mr. Mohnani was not comfortable because of his relationship with the respondent, he could recuse himself. Mr. Mohnani stated he was not uncomfortable; he wanted to disclose his prior relationship.

Paul Kim, attorney for Thomas Sparks, the adjacent unit owner, said his client had no notice of the apartment defects since the work was done without permits and Mr. Oriel had done the work to procure additional space in his apartment, 910. He stated the

work posed a risk of harm and a public safety issue to unit 909 since there was no proper fire wall between the two units. Mr. Kim said after being notified of the illegal work in July, Mr. Oriel's counsel had indicated that no changes would be made. Because of this lack of good faith, Mr. Kim requested the motion to continue be denied.

Mr. Sparks said he had purchased this unit as a retirement home and had noticed the violation when a contractor was examining the unit for rehabilitation. He said he had spoken to Mr. Oriel about it but nothing had ever been done.

Mr. Murphy believed Mr. Oriel lived in the unit part of the year. He stated when the wall was enclosed, Mr. Oriel had been referred to the contractor by the condo association.

Mr. Sparks presented the blueprint of the violation to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a continuance. In a voice vote, motion failed 0-7.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 28 days, by 11/25/14 or a fine of \$50 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion failed 2-5 with only Mr. Nelson and Ms. Hinton in favor.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 28 days, by 11/25/14 or a fine of \$150 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 5-2 with Mr. Mohnani and Mr. Dooley opposed.

Case: CE14090039
3145 Northeast 9 Street
ESPOSITO ENTERPRISES INC

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS COMMERCIAL BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE
INTERIOR DEMOLITION AND REMODELING WITHOUT THE
REQUIRED PERMITS OR INSPECTIONS.

Inspector Masula reported a Stop Work Order had been posted on the property on 9/4/14. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the

violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$250 per day.

Vincenzo Esposito, owner, said he had been unaware of the violations and intended to address them.

Juan Cardona, general contractor, said a tenant had done the work without the owner's knowledge. He requested 91 days to address the problems.

Mr. Esposito agreed not to allow a new tenant to move in until the property was in compliance.

Inspector Masula said he had been told that the former tenant had subleased the space from the adjacent tenant, not the owner. He was concerned about the safety of the upstairs apartment tenant. He suggested the owner obtain an immediate electrical permit to ensure everything was safe, as well as a letter from the design professional stating the floor was structurally sound. Mr. Cardona agreed to get that done within 28 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 28 days, by 11/25/14 or a fine of \$75 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14052132

5431 Northeast 25 Avenue # 301B
JABBOUR, ATEF M

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:
FBC(2010) 105.4.4

THE SHOWER PAN HAS BEEN REPLACED WITHOUT THE
REQUIRED PLUMBING PERMIT AND REQUIRED INSPECTIONS.

Inspector Masula said the case was begun pursuant to a complaint. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$25 per day.

Michael Matta, the owner's representative and property tenant, said in May, the association manager notified him of a leak into the unit below and the manager had sent someone to inspect, who determined the shower pan was leaking. Mr. Matta believed the leak was caused by damaged tile on the wall, not the shower pan. He had

subsequently turned the water off in the bathroom and the neighbor reported no new leaking issues. Mr. Matta needed to leave the country and informed the property manager that he had turned the water off and he would address the problem when he returned. The manager agreed. While Mr. Matta was away, the manager hired a plumber, who entered the property without his or the owner's permission, broken into the locked bathroom and started work. A friend had checked on the unit, found the workers and notified Mr. Matta's employee.

Chair Elfman asked if Mr. Matta intended to consult with the owner and the manager about how to obtain a permit. Mr. Matta said the manager had informed him that the "permit is okay; everything is fine" but Inspector Masula had indicated otherwise. Inspector Masula stated the condo did not have an on-site manager; the Board of Directors managed the property. He said what had taken place between the association, the tenant and the owner was potentially a civil matter. He intended to follow up with the condo board.

Mr. Nelson wished Inspector Masula to ask the condo association to pull a permit for the work that had been done. Inspector Masula stated a permit application had been submitted by that contractor but the plans needed to be picked up for corrections.

Ms. Hasan advised the Board that the property owner was responsible to pull the permit, regardless of who had done the work; a permit would not be issued to the condo association for work done in a non-common area. She said the City could ask an association representative attend a future hearing or subpoena a representative, but it was still the owner's responsibility to comply the violation.

Ms. Hasan withdrew the case and agreed to try to compel an association representative to attend another hearing.

Case: CE14062319

609 Northeast 13 Avenue # 302
HAROUNOFF HOLDINGS LLC

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS CONDO UNIT HAS BEEN ALTERED WITH THE
REMODELING OF THE KITCHEN WITHOUT THE REQUIRED
PERMITS OR INSPECTIONS.

Inspector Masula stated the case was begun pursuant to a complaint and a Stop Work Order had been posted on the property. He submitted photos of the property and the

Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$100 per day.

Alain Harounoff, the previous owner, explained they had purchased the property for an investor. He said he would do what was required to bring the property into compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Thilborger, seconded by Mr. Nelson to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 28 days, by 11/25/14 or a fine of \$50 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-1 with Mr. Mohnani opposed.

The Board took a brief break. When the Board returned, Ms. Ellis had left the meeting and Mr. Smith took her place on the dais.

Case: CE14062352
800 Corporate Drive
RCC II INC
%CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 10/9/14.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

Complied:

FBC(2010) 105.1

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED
AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT THE REQUIRED INSPECTIONS
APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT
THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Oliva said the case was begun pursuant to a complaint. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$250 per day.

Inspector Oliva clarified that the work had been done without a permit and the permit application had been submitted after the case was opened. He had expedited the permit and it had been issued on 8/21 so the work could be done. The permit plan specifications contained the correct slopes but the work done did not comply with the plans; the ramps were too steep. Inspector Oliva stated FBC (2010) 105.1, the permit requirement, was in compliance, but FBC (2010) 110.9 required inspections to be passed and was still in violation. Mr. Nelson said the respondent had a certain period of time under the permit to have the inspections, and wondered why the City did not wait to open the case after that time had expired.

Inspector Oliva stated the City had received complaints from the Association for the Protection of Handicapped Persons regarding the ramps.

Mr. Nelson again wondered why the respondent was not covered by the period allowed to complete the work. Mr. Jolly said, "Arguably, they're not in violation." Inspector Oliva said the City must protect anyone who might use the ramp.

Michael Krant, architect, said the sidewalk slopes were original. After the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1992, certain curb cuts and parking lot restriping was done, and he did not know if these were done with permits. Mr. Krant stated he did not believe any of the hardscape improvements were done without permits. In July, Mr. Krant had sent a letter to the City with a schedule of estimated construction completion and requested 150 days. He reported they were currently ahead of schedule.

Mr. Krant continued that subsequent to the permitting, a federal lawsuit had been filed against the property for ADA violations and the owner's attorneys had advised that no work should be started until the judge had been contacted. Mr. Krant said there had been a gap of approximately six to eight weeks between issuance of the permit and starting work, which was still in progress. He confirmed that the work stated on the plans would bring the parking area into compliance with ADA statutes and the Florida Accessibility Code.

Mr. Krant said he was surprised that he was appearing before the Board, since the permit had been issued. He believed the work would be complete by Thanksgiving, and felt that tying a fine to not being in compliance within the timeframe would be unfair. He stated the permit had been issued 8/27. Inspector Oliva said the work was started approximately 10/10. Mr. Nelson stated the owner had 90 days from the date of work commencing to call for the first inspection and be in compliance with the permit. Inspector Oliva reiterated that the only remaining violation was the requirement to pass final inspection.

Ms. Hasan stated the City's objection to finding in favor of the respondent because there was no ADA access to the property. Mr. Jolly pointed out that this was not the violation for which the owner had been cited. Mr. Nelson agreed there may be because for an ADA lawsuit against the owner, but this was not the Board's concern.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find for the respondent that the violations did not exist as cited. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14071289

1920 S Ocean Drive # 1207
JOHN MACDONALD LIV TR
MACDONALD, JOHN H TRSTEE

Certified mail sent to the owner was hand delivered on 10/20/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC(2010) 105.1

THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM ARE BEING REMODELED
WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.
THIS WORK INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO FRAMING
AND DRYWALL.

FBC(2010) 105.4.3

THE KITCHEN CABINETS, ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING,
DRYWALL HAVE BEEN DEMOLISHED AND REMOVED WITHOUT
THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 105.4.4

THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM ARE BEING REMODELED
WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.
THIS WORK INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO PLUMBING
WORK AND REMOVING AND REPLACING FIXTURES.

FBC(2010) 105.4.5

THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM ARE BEING REMODELED
WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS.
THIS WORK INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO
ELECTRICAL WORK, EXPOSED CONDUIT THAT IS NOT
SECURED, REMOVING AND REPLACING FIXTURES AND
DEVICES.

Inspector Masula stated a Stop Work Order had been posted on the property on 8/29. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$100 per day, per violation.

John MacDonald, owner, said he had acquired the property through an inheritance. He said he had met with a contractor on 10/23 and was awaiting his contract. He stated his mother had lived in the unit for 40 years, and they had been battling termites for 35 years. He had inspected the property a couple of years ago and determined that the fire wall had never been installed between this and the adjacent unit. Mr. MacDonald described where walls had been removed. He said the Building Official had informed him that permits were not required for the kitchen cabinets. Mr. MacDonald said no plumbing or electrical had been moved.

Mr. MacDonald had examined the original building plans showing block wall and a plaster wall and sent a letter to the condo association that the walls were common elements, but he said the condo believed it was his responsibility to replace the walls. He stated the unit looked the same as the pictures shown by Inspector Masula.

Mr. MacDonald agreed to have a contractor pull a demolition permit for the demolition work that had been done.

Mr. Nelson asked Ms. Hasan how the City handled permits for co-ops. Ms. Hasan stated the City would accept a permit application from the shareholder/unit occupier.

Inspector Masula said he would check with the Building Official regarding whether he would accept one demolition permit to comply the case.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14090230

101 Southeast 19 Street
VASILE, MARIA

Service was via posting on the property on 10/20/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC(2010) 105.1

WORK WITHOUT PERMITS.

1. CUSTOMER JUST COMPLETED A PROPERLY PERMITTED WINDOW JOB. NOW DOING INTERIOR UPGRADING AND INSTALLING NEW ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING FIXTURES.
2. REPLACING THE DRYWALL ON THE CEILING AND WALLS.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT THE REQUIRED INSPECTIONS APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Masula stated a Stop Work Order had been posted on the property on 9/5. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$50 per day, per violation. He confirmed that the permit in process would comply the violations.

Maria Vasile, owner, said she had been working on getting the permits and the plumbing permit had already been issued.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE14080898

1200 Northeast 4 Avenue
IL INVESTMENTS LLC

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14. Ms. Goldwire read an email from Alex II, one of the owners, stating a contractor and engineer had been hired and requesting 90 days.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THE FOLLOWING WORK INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO:

1. NEW DOORS, FRAMING, SHEATHING, LATH, STUCCO.
2. A/C IS BEING INSTALLED WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS OR INSPECTIONS.

Inspector Masula reported that a permit application had been submitted on 10/3 and was awaiting pickup for corrections. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$25 per day.

Inspector Masula explained that the owner had purchased the property with the violations and was at first resistant to address them, since they had been caused by a prior owner. He believed the owner was now working to address the violations.

Jorge Hernandez, general contractor, said he had been hired the previous week because the first contractor had been fired. He had prepared new applications and was awaiting plans from the architect. Mr. Hernandez said the air conditioners were wall units and if permits were required, the owner would hire a mechanical contractor to get them. He anticipated submitting revised plans to address comments on the previous application.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

At 1:05, Mr. Nelson temporarily left the dais.

Case: CE14072221

2449 Northeast 22 Terrace
B&F PROPERTIES 2 LLC

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS PROPERTY HAS BEEN ALTERED TO INCLUDE BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO:

1. THE ENCLOSURE OF THE GARAGE INTO LIVING SPACE WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND/OR INSPECTIONS. THIS WILL REQUIRE A NEW CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR THIS NEW LIVING SPACE.
2. A NEW DOCK HAS BEEN BUILT WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMIT AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 105.4.11

THE A/C HAS BEEN REPLACED WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMIT AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 105.4.18

A NEW FENCE HAS BEEN BUILT WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMIT AND/OR INSPECTIONS.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS PROPERTY OWNER WILL BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, PASS ALL REQUIRED FIELD INSPECTIONS AND CLOSE ALL PERMITS BEFORE THIS CODE CASE WILL BE COMPLIED AND CLOSED.

Inspector Masula reported that on 8/4. A Stop Work Order had been posted on the property. He described permits that had been issued, closed and those that were still open or in review. Inspector Masula submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$50 per day, per violation.

Brandy Joe Pollock, owner, said they had purchased the property with all of the violations except for the gate, which they had installed. After the Stop Work Order had been posted on the property, they had begun to pull permits for the violations. He requested 91 days. Mr. Pollock stated the house had a pending sale and they were supposed to close the previous week. The new owners had met with Inspector Masula and were aware of the violations.

Motion made by Mr. Dooley, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, with Mr. Nelson absent from the dais, motion passed 6-0.

At 1:10, Mr. Nelson returned to the dais.

Case: CE14091100

2850 Northeast 30 Street #2
FREIER, DANNY S

Service was via posting on the property on 10/21/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:

FBC(2010) 105.1

KITCHEN REMODELED WITHOUT THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS. THIS WILL REQUIRE A STRUCTURAL PERMIT, AN ELECTRICAL PERMIT AND A PLUMBING PERMIT.

Inspector Masula reported a Stop Work Order had been posted on the property on 9/15. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$100 per day. He said a master permit application for structural only had been submitted; the plumbing and electrical permit applications had not been submitted.

Danny Freier, owner, stated he had purchased the property in February and lived in Minnesota. A handyman he hired through Craig's List had persuaded him to allow him to move into the property and subsequently run up the electric and cable bills. He had also stolen items, fraudulently used Mr. Freier's charge card and done unauthorized work, including demolishing the kitchen cabinets.

Mr. Thilborger asked Inspector Masula if a demolition permit would comply the violation. Inspector Masula stated the permit application already submitted was for a kitchen re-build; a structural permit was required because there would be framing and drywall involved in the project. He stated he would accept a demolition permit for the work already done and Mr. Freier could apply for a renovation permit when he was prepared to do that work. Inspector Masula said the City would normally not close the demolition permit unit a re-build permit application was submitted.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE13101596

650 Tennis Club Drive # 110
RICCARDI, SAMANTHA
%RICCARDI, CHRISTOPHER

Service was via posting on the property on 10/8/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED AND CONSTRUCTION
WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED
PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS IN THE DWELLING.

1. ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING RESTORATIONS ARE IN
PROGRESS WITH NEW CABINETS AND FIXTURES BEING
INSTALLED INSIDE THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM AREAS
WITH NEW DRYWALL.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED
AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED
INSPECTIONS APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT
THROUGHOUT THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Thomas Kopf, power of attorney, said the owner had purchased the property in March 2013 and the only work done was removal of moldy sheet rock and the air conditioning unit. He referred to a 2011 inspection report on the property citing work without permits and noting the condo association was trying to purchase the unit. Mr. Kopf said that case had been closed.

Mr. Kopf stated Mr. Riccardi had been trying to sell the unit but the condo association wanted to buy it, so they had refused to authorize two purchasers, Mr. Kopf's daughter and wife. Mr. Kopf had a contract application from Scott Construction that he felt would address the violations but it had not been signed because they were waiting for the sale of the unit to be settled.

Mr. Nelson said the ownership issue was not a problem; Mr. Riccardi needed to apply for permits. Inspector Oliva informed the Board that the unit must get an asbestos removal permit from Broward County before the City would issue a permit. The City needed a shop drawing showing the work and a general contractor to apply for the permit.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

The Board took a brief break. Upon returning, Chair Elfman had left and Mr. Thilborger chaired the meeting.

Case: CE14051627

1330 Northwest 7 Place

MCCLOVER, ULYSSES & EVELYN

Service was via posting on the property on 10/8/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED AND CONSTRUCTION WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS:

1. A LARGE STORAGE BUILDING HAS BEEN INSTALLED AT THE FRONT OF THE PROPERTY.
2. A WOOD FENCE WAS ERECTED AROUND THE PROPERTY LINE.
3. A NEW DRIVEWAY WAS BUILT AT THE REAR ALL THE WAY TO THE MAIN STREET.
4. DUCTED CENTRAL A/C ON BOTH SIDES OF THE DUPLEX.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT THE REQUIRED INSPECTIONS APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE14060442

727 Northwest 17 Street
U S BANK NA TRSTEE

Service was via posting on the property on 10/8/14 and at City Hall on 10/17/14.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED AND CONSTRUCTION WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS, INSPECTIONS AND CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FROM THE CITY BUILDING DEPARTMENT:

THIS CASE WAS OPENED TO ADDRESS THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT CE12040793 FOR WORK WITHOUT PERMITS AND A STOP WORK ORDER WAS ISSUED BACK THEN.

1. SOME MAJOR RENOVATIONS WERE DONE, OTHERS WERE IN-PROGRESS WITHOUT PERMITS. THIS INCLUDES THE REMOVAL AND CONSTRUCTION OF INTERIOR WALLS AND ALTERATIONS OF THE APPROVED FLOOR PLAN OF THE DWELLING.
2. THE EXISTING BATHROOMS AND KITCHEN WERE ENTIRELY ALTERED WITH ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING FIXTURES.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT THE REQUIRED INSPECTIONS APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Oliva explained there had been a case against the previous owner for the same violations in 2012. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE14062184

517 Northwest 7 Avenue
SOUTHERN REO GROUP LLC

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 10/9/14.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2010) 105.1

THIS BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED AND CONSTRUCTION
WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED
PERMITS, INSPECTIONS AND CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY
FROM THE CITY BUILDING DEPARTMENT.

A STOP WORK ORDER WAS ISSUED FOR:

1. WORK IS IN PROGRESS. THE INTERIOR IS BEING
REMODELED.
2. UPGRADING THE ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING AND THE
MECHANICAL SYSTEMS.
3. NEW FRAMING AND DRYWALL IN PROGRESS.

FBC(2010) 110.9

THIS WORK IS IN PROGRESS OR IT HAS BEEN PERFORMED
AND/OR COVERED-UP WITHOUT THE REQUIRED INSPECTIONS
APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGHOUT
THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation. A Stop Work Order had been posted on the property but Inspector Oliva was unaware if it was being followed.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 1/27/15 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE11060536

920 Northwest 9 Avenue
JAGITIANI, JAY

This case was first heard on 5/28/13 to comply by 7/23/13. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the property was now in compliance.

Case: CE13101030

1329 Northwest 7 Terrace
TOTAL HOUSING INC

This case was first heard on 3/25/14 to comply by 4/22/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported that only final inspections were needed. He recommended a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE13120663

1309 Northwest 24 Avenue
WEIT, RICHARD C & MELANIE

This case was first heard on 7/22/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the owner had applied for a permit in August. The application had failed plan review and never been picked up for corrections. He did not recommend an extension.

The Board took no action.

Case: CE14010280

1341 Northwest 3 Avenue
VILLA, ROBERT
VILLAGOMEZ, JOSE C TERRAZAS

This case was first heard on 6/24/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported there had been progress and recommended a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 1/27/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE14031457

2236 Northwest 20 Street
BABY BOY INVESTMENT GROUP INC

This case was first heard on 9/23/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the owner had promised to renew the plumbing permit weeks ago but so far this had not been done. Inspector Oliva did not recommend an extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 147-day extension to 3/25/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion failed 0-6.

Case: CE14060438

930 Northwest 14 Street
ADEA REAL ESTATE LLC

This case was first heard on 9/23/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported an electrical contractor had submitted a permit application but no progress had been made. He stated there were life safety issues and he did not recommend any extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 147-day extension to 3/25/15, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion failed 0-6.

Case: CE13040766

3038 North Federal Highway #F
RJD HOLDINGS LLC

This case was first heard on 6/24/14 to comply by 8/26/14. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported the permits had been issued but there had been a clerical error in which the electrical permit had not been charge a double fee. The fee had been revised and the owner had agreed to pay it. Once it was paid, the case would be complied and closed. Inspector Masula recommended a 28-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 28-day extension to 11/25/14, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE14021595

1842 Northeast 26 Avenue
AILOS, MORDECHAI M

This case was first heard on 4/22/14 to comply by 7/22/14, amended to 8/26/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

Robert Masula, Building Inspector, reported the permit applications had failed review on 8/5 and were awaiting pickup for corrections. The property owner had left a message indicating he had been out of work and was forced to choose between paying an architect and paying his mortgage.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find that the violations were not in compliance by the Order date, and therefore the fines as stated in the Order would begin on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE10080452

2461 Northwest 16 Court
HABERSHAM, TAMMIE D
SLAUGHTER, JOHNNIE

This case was first heard on 7/22/14 to comply by 9/23/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of an \$850 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, stated there was another case open against this owner and this case had been opened in 2010. Mr. Hernandez had waived the double fee in 2010 for the owner's permit but he had never submitted an application. Inspector Oliva recommended imposition of the fine.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Dooley, to find the violations were not in compliance by the Order date, and to impose the \$850 fine, which would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE14030038

2790 Southwest 3 Street
MATTHEW WESLEY JOHNSON REV TR
KEELING, CINDY TRSTEE

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 9/23/14. Violations, notice and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of a \$3,400 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported there had been no progress and recommended imposition of the fine.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find the violations were not in compliance by the Order date, and to impose the \$3,400 fine, which would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Case: CE14051417

2500 Southwest 14 Avenue
THE GROVE AT RIVER OAKS HOMEOWNERS

This case was first heard on 8/26/14 to comply by 10/28/14. Violations and notice were as noted in the agenda. The property was not in compliance and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the property was in compliance. Ms. Goldwire stated attorney Ryan Aboud had been provided notice on October 23.

George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported there was no compliance and since this was a life safety issue he recommended imposition of the fine. He stated the attorney was recently hired and Inspector Oliva had sent him photos of the violation.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Dooley, to find that the violations were not in compliance by the Order date, and therefore the fines as stated in the Order would begin on 10/29/14 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Mohnani, to approve the minutes of the Board's September meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to approve the minutes of the Board's August meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

For the Good of the City

The Board, Mr. Jolly and Ms. Hasan discussed how the Board had ruled on cases CE14062352 and CE08070448. Mr. Nelson explained that one was a new case for which a permit had already been issued and one was an old case which had been in violation with no permit when the Board first heard the case, which explained the difference.

The Board discussed a case in which the Board had granted a short extension and Mr. Nelson explained to Mr. Mohnani that the rationale was to have the owner report in 28 days on whether there had been progress.

Cases Complied

The below listed cases were complied. Additional information regarding respondents, violations, etc. can be found in the agenda, which is incorporated into this record.

CE14031207	CE14092163	CE14031640
CE14071463	CE14080485	CE10071525

Cases Withdrawn

The below listed cases were withdrawn. Additional information regarding respondents, violations, etc. can be found in the agenda, which is incorporated into this record.

None.

CE14041808	CE14041810	CE14041812
CE14041945	CE14041799	CE14041802
CE14041952	CE14041804	CE14041814
CE14041816	CE14041954	CE14041955
CE13011639		

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.



Chair, Code Enforcement Board

ATTEST:



Clerk, Code Enforcement Board

NOTE: The agenda associated with this meeting is incorporated into this record by reference.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

Minutes prepared by: Jamie Opperee, ProtoType Inc.